

## Office of the Attorney General State of Texas

DAN MORALES
ATTORNEY GENERAL

April 28, 1998

Mr. John Steiner
Division Chief
City of Austin
Law Department
P.O. Box 1546
Austin, Texas 78767-1546

OR98-1062

Dear Mr. Steiner:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Texas Open Records Act, chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 115032.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for information related to the operation and maintenance of Barton Springs Pool. You assert that the requested information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and have reviewed the submitted documents.

Section 552.103(a), the "litigation exception," excepts from disclosure information relating to litigation to which the governing body is or may be a party. The governing body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 (1990) at 4. The governing body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

Litigation cannot be regarded as "reasonably anticipated" unless there is concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture. Open Records Decision Nos. 452 (1986), 331 (1982), 328 (1982). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision Nos. 452 (1986), 350 (1982). This office has concluded that litigation is reasonably anticipated when an attorney makes a written demand for disputed payments and promises further legal action if they are not forthcoming, and when an attorney is hired who threatens to sue a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 555 (1990), 551 (1990).

However, the fact that an individual has hired an attorney, or that a request for information was made by an attorney, does not, without more, demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983) at 2.

It appears from the information submitted that certain parties intend to file suit against the city for its operation and maintenance of the Barton Springs Pool and surrounding, city-owned property. We conclude that the city has demonstrated that litigation is reasonably anticipated in this case. We also find that the documents are related to the anticipated litigation, and may be withheld.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

We are resolving this matter with an informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. This ruling is limited to the particular records at issue under the facts presented to us in this request and should not be relied on as a previous determination regarding any other records. If you have any questions regarding this ruling, please contact our office.

Yours very truly,

June B. Harden

Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

JBH/glg

Ref.: ID# 115032

Enclosures: Submitted documents

cc: Mr. James Mark Gentle

Attorney at Law P.O. Box 1026 Austin, Texas 78767 (w/o enclosures)